<u>REMARKS</u>

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 12-14, 17, 19, 20, 40, 41, 43-45, 47-50, 53, and 54 stand rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Saito et al. (US 2002/0172207) in view of Malki et al. (US 2001/0046223) and Inoue (US 2002/0036991). Claims 9, 16, 46, 51, and 52 stand rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Malki, Inoue, and Sawada et al. (US 2002/0016858).

It is respectfully submitted that the rejections of each of these claims should be withdrawn for the following reasons.

In the "Response to Arguments" section of the Office Action at page 2, item 1, the Office sets forth the following argument in response to arguments previously advanced by the Applicant:

> "The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's arguments because Saito in combination with Malki and Inoue as a whole, teaches what claim 1 recites – that is <u>Malki discloses setting a predetermined tentative permission time for which the mobile terminal tentatively permits an access to the desired network (paragraph [0055], e.g., the lifetime of the bicasting should be set to no more than 10 seconds to limit the load imposed on the network by the bicasting)</u> and Inoue discloses setting a time until acquiring the authentication result (paragraphs [0017], [0023], [0028], [0067], [0133], e.g., it is possible to enable the authenticated telephone network access by defining the authentication sequence between the home network device and the mobile terminal device, and the access to the resource on the cellular phone network side is permitted only for the device that has successfully completed the authentication sequence) (emphasis added)."

However, the Applicants respectfully disagree with the above underlined argument.

By way of review, claim 1 is directed towards a radio communication management method and recites the feature of:

"...wherein the server which manages the link connection, after receiving the first information, sets a predetermined tentative permission time for which the mobile terminal tentatively permits an access to the desired network... (emphasis added)"

Paragraph [0055] of Malki discloses that:

-a "mobile node should send a binding update to the current mobility anchor point with the M flag set, thereby indicating a mobility anchor point registration, and the B flag set, thereby indicating that bicasting is required by the mobile node"; and

-"[i]n addition, the lifetime of the bicasting should be set to no more than 10 seconds to limit the load imposed on the network by the bicasting."

By way of review, in Malki, some special procedures (such as sending a binding update with the M flag and B flag set) must be performed in advance of a handover between a mobile terminal and a mobility anchor point in order for the mobile terminal to receive special packets (i.e. bicasting packets) from the mobility anchor point after handover. (See Malki, par. [0057]). If some special procedures are not performed before handover, the mobile node cannot receive these bicasting packets.

In contrast, the "predetermined tentative permission time" recited by each of the independent claims in the instant application is a time during which a mobile terminal is tentatively permitted access to a desired network, even if the mobile terminal has not yet been authorized. According to this feature recited by each of the independent claims, even a mobile terminal which has not yet been authorized or has performed any special procedures can get access to the desired network immediately after handover.

The "bicasting" disclosed by Malki has nothing to do with tentatively permitting access to a desired network, as recited by each of the independent claims in the present application. In

15

fact, paragraph [0047] of Malki discloses that "[w]hen a mobile node changes mobility anchor points," it "should send a binding update to its current mobility anchor point without setting the B bit (emphasis added)," in order to "deregister its existing care-of-address." Since setting the "B bit" indicates bicasting (see par. [0055]), and since Malki discloses that the mobile node can change mobility anchor points without setting the "B bit," it is clear that the bicasting disclosed by Malki is not the same as the "predetermined tentative permission time" during which a mobile terminal is tentatively permitted access to a desired network, as recited by each of the independent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1, 14, 43, and 50, and all dependent claims therefrom, should be withdrawn for at least this reason.

Furthermore, Malki's bicasting time (i.e., 10 seconds) only defines a time for which a mobile terminal can receive bicasting packets from a mobility anchor point via both connections before and after hand-off according to conventional soft handover procedures.

In contrast, the "predetermined tentative permission time" recited by each of the independent claims defines a time during which a mobile terminal tentatively is permitted access to a desired network.

Thus, Malki merely discloses that a mobile terminal can receive bicasting packets from a mobility anchor point, and fails to disclose or suggest the recited features of each of the independent claims that a mobile terminal can have a predetermined tentative permission time and can tentatively obtain access to a desired network for the predetermined tentative permission time.

16

Therefore, despite the allegations set forth in the Office Action, the bicasting time disclosed by Malki is quite different from the recited feature of the "predetermined tentative permission time" recited by each of the independent claims in the present application.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: June 24, 2010   James E. Ledbetter
JEL/DEA/att   Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 008638-05102
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 457-0160
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559
DC 8638-5102 156029